

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested.

The specification is amended by the present response to include suggested headings.

Claims 14 and 23 are amended by the present response to address the objections thereto.

Claims 14-26 are pending in this application. Claims 14-26 were rejected under 35 U.S.C § 103(a) as unpatentable over U.S. patent 4,300,042 to Oldenkamp et al. (herein “Oldenkamp”) in view of U.S. patent 6,092,798 to Hiratuka et al. (herein “Hiratuka”) and U.S. patent 4,040,345 to Adams et al. (herein “Adams”).

Addressing the above-noted rejection of Claims 14-26 under 35 U.S.C § 103 as unpatentable over Oldenkamp in view of Hiratuka and Adams, that rejection is traversed by the present response.

It is initially noted that each of independent Claims 14 and 23 is amended by the present response to clarify features recited therein. Specifically, those claims first now consistently refer to “configuration parameters.” Independent Claims 14 and 24 now also clarify that the printing of those configuration parameters on the configuration ticket results in a “visible” printing. As discussed in the present specification configuration parameters written on the magnetic strip of a configuration ticket are also printed thereon, to provide a written trace to an installer (see for example the present specification at page 10, lines 8-12 and lines 28-30).

In the claimed invention, in a machine having a magnetic read/write station, a thermal printing station and a control, a configuration ticket can be prepared, which may have the same format as the ticket normally issued by the machine, and the configuration ticket includes “at least certain configuration parameters of the ticket processing device”. Further, configuration parameters can be visibly printed on a same ticket as a ticket normally issued

by the machine, and with the creation of the configuration data the visibly printed information on the configuration ticket matches the magnetic information stored in the configuration ticket. Such a ticket can be used to be read by the read/write section of the machine to thereby input configuration information into the machine.

Such a structure can find particular usefulness because ticket processing devices are often installed in various places. Thus, the people servicing such devices normally have to handle a number of capabilities, ranging from purely mechanical capabilities to having the ability to configure the machine. The present invention makes it possible for persons who may have little or no knowledge about what is necessary to configure the machine to only go to the machine with a “configuration ticket” prepared in advance by personnel specifically trained in configuring such a machine. In that instance such a service person merely has to put the previously prepared configuration ticket into the machine to properly configure the machine as desired. Further, the visibly printed indications on the configuration ticket provide a clear trace of what has been performed by the servicing personnel.

Applicants respectfully submit that the applied art does not teach or suggest the clarified features in the claim of the configuration ticket including visibly printing information corresponding to the magnetically stored information.

To meet the features of the configuration ticket the outstanding Office Action now cites the teachings in Oldenkamp. In that respect, applicants note that Oldenkamp discloses the use of a program card that can be used by a key operator or vendor to modify parametric data in a system.¹ However, applicants note that Oldenkamp does not disclose or suggest that the program card includes visibly printed information corresponding to a magnetic inscription of configuration parameters.

¹ Oldenkamp at column 4, lines 59-64.

As noted above, one of the benefits in the claimed invention is utilizing visibly printed indications on a configuration ticket to provide a clear trace of what has been performed by a servicing personnel. Oldenkamp does not teach or suggest such features.

Moreover, no teachings in Hiratuka or Adams can overcome the above-noted deficiencies in Oldenkamp.

Applicants also note the general structure of the device of Oldenkamp differs significantly from that of the claimed invention. More particularly, Oldenkamp is not directed to a ticket processing device that can include means for reading a magnetic stripe of a card or means for storing reading data.

Applicants note Oldenkamp is directed to an apparatus for a vending machine, and particularly for a photocopy machine that can register magnetic data on a magnetic stripe of a magnetic card inserted in an apparatus, which makes it possible to deliver cards having a specific amount, a count number, and a delimiter value that limits the use of the card (for example an expiration date, a department number, a system identification number). Thus, a system of Oldenkamp makes it possible to deliver cards having a predetermined amount to a user, whereas in the background art that Oldenkamp attempts to improve on, it was required that such a delivering of cards be made in a remote factory.

Applicants note that the device in Oldenkamp is not a ticket processing device and is not provided with means for reading a magnetic stripe of a card and means for storing reading data. The device of Oldenkamp differs significantly from that of the claims. The claimed device is not only capable of producing configuration tickets, but is also capable of reading contents of the configuration ticket and writing on a magnetic stripe of a configuration ticket. Oldenkamp merely teaches production of a program card but does not teach or suggest how to use such a program card in a ticket processing device.

Moreover, neither Hiratuka nor Adams teaches or suggest utilizing a configuration ticket as in the claimed invention, and thus neither Hiratuka nor Adams can overcome the above-noted deficiencies in Oldenkamp.

Further, the noted teachings in Hiratuka and Adams do not have any relevance whatsoever to the program card in Oldenkamp. The basis for the outstanding rejection appears to cite teachings in Hiratuka and Adams directed to conventional ticket issuing apparatuses and to apply such teachings to the device in Oldenkamp. However, the basis for the outstanding rejection is not directed to the user card in Oldenkamp, but it is only directed to the program card in Oldenkamp. The teachings in Hiratuka and Adams have no relevance whatsoever to such a program card in Oldenkamp.

In such ways, applicants respectfully submit that no combination of teachings of Oldenkamp in view of Hiratuka and Adams meets the features of amended independent Claims 14 and 23, and the claims dependent therefrom. Therefore, applicants respectfully submit that each of the currently pending claims distinguishes over the applied art.

As no other issues are pending in this application, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is now in condition for allowance, and it is hereby respectfully requested that this case be passed to issue.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



Gregory J. Maier
Attorney of Record
Registration No. 25,599

Surinder Sachar
Registration No. 34,423

Customer Number
22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413 -2220
(OSMMN 06/04)
SNS:aif